## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

IN RE: . Case No. 09-31703 (KRH)

GREENBRIER HOTEL CORPORATION, et al.,

. 701 East Broad Street . Richmond, VA 23219

## REDACTED TRANSCRIPT

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
BEFORE HONORABLE KEVIN R. HUENNEKENS
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Debtors: McGuireWoods LLC

By: DION W. HAYES, ESQ.

AARON G. McCOLLOUGH, ESQ.

One James Center 901 East Cary Street Richmond, VA 23219

For Greenbrier Council

of Labor Unions: Guerrieri, Edmond, Clayman & Bartos

By: JOSEPH GUERRIERI, JR., ESQ. 1625 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Suite 700

Washington, DC

For the U.S. Trustee: Office of the U.S. Trustee

By: ROBERT B. VAN ARSDALE, ESQ.

200 Granby Street, Room 625

Norfolk, VA

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@optonline.net

(609) 586-2311 Fax No. (609) 587-3599

INDEX

WITNESS FOR THE DEBTORS:

**PAGE** 

Michael McGovern [Testimony redacted]

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

2

5

6

7

8

9

11

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

241

25

COURT CLERK: All rise. The United States Bankruptcy 2 Court for the Eastern District of Virginia is now in session. The Honorable Kevin R. Huennekens presiding. Please be seated and come to order.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: The matter of Greenbrier Hotel Corporation.

MR. HAYES: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Hayes.

MR. HAYES: Dion Hayes, with McGuireWoods here on 10 behalf of the debtors.

Your Honor, we would propose to go through the agenda 12∥that was filed yesterday, essentially in order. We amended the agenda yesterday. If the Court needs an additional copy, I'd 14 be happy to hand one up.

THE COURT: I have the amended agenda and it would be 16 the Court's preference that you go through the amended agenda as filed.

MR. HAYES: Having said that, when we get to it there's one place where we wanted to move something to the back, that remains contested.

THE COURT: All right, very good.

MR. HAYES: I just wanted to trick you, Judge.

Item number one is uncontested. That's the application of the debtor to employ McGuireWoods as bankruptcy counsel. We would ask the Court to entertain that motion.

## J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

uncontested. It's the application of the debtors to retain

Huddleston Bolen, LLP, as special corporate counsel.

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Any party wish to be heard in connection 2 with the debtors' motion to retain Huddleston & Bolen as special corporate counsel? (No audible response)

THE COURT: That motion will be granted.

MR. HAYES: Your Honor, item number five is also uncontested. It's the debtors' motion to authorize the debtors to employ professionals in the ordinary course of business.

THE COURT: Any party wish to be heard in connection with the debtors' motion to employ professionals in the ordinary course of business?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: That motion will be granted.

MR. HAYES: Your Honor, item number six is the motion for final approval of our debtor-in-possession loan. At the first day hearing, Your Honor, we put on a proffer for Mr. Guy Davis, our financial advisor of Protiviti. Rather than repeat that proffer here, Your Honor, we would propose to incorporate that proffer by reference into the record at this hearing.

THE COURT: Any party wish to examine Mr. Davis or contest the receipt of the proffer?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: All right, the proffer is accepted.

MR. HAYES: And, Your Honor, this motion is also 25∥uncontested, we submitted to the Court yesterday a redline of

1 the proposed final order. There's some modest changes from the  $2 \parallel$  interim order and I'd like to run through those with the Court, if that's acceptable.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. HAYES: Does the Court have a copy of that

THE COURT: Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

redline?

MR. HAYES: Okay. Your Honor, we -- in several places we deleted a reference to the Creditors' Committee or the possibility of a Creditors' Committee.

As the Court will recall, the Court entered an order 12∥deeming us to be a small business and ordering that there would 13 not be a Creditors' Committee. The ten day period for parties 14 to seek reconsideration or to object or to appeal that order has passed. So, that that order, by its terms, is now final and unappealable, so we thought it appropriate to delete references to the Creditors' Committee.

Another material change, Your Honor, many of the changes are not material, I won't walk through all of them, but in paragraph five, Your Honor, upon further review of the books and records of the debtors, we concluded that we had overstated by approximately \$278,000 the amount of the CSX prepetition indebtedness, that is the amount of the prepetition unsecured claims that CSX holds against the debtors and that change was made in paragraph 5A of the final order.

The order, Your Honor, is without prejudice to the 2 right of CSX to file additional claims against the debtors by the bar date.

THE COURT: All right, very good.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HAYES: That latter point, Your Honor, is made express at the end of paragraph 31, in which we indicated that the order is without prejudice to the rights of the prepetition lender, to assert any other prepetition claims.

Your Honor, those are the only material changes to 10 $\parallel$  the final order, as compared to the interim order, and based on the record from the prior hearing and the lack of any objections to the DIP loan, Your Honor, we would ask the Court to grant the motion for final approval of the DIP loan.

THE COURT: Does any party wish to be heard in connection with final approval of the debtor-in-possession financing?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: All right, that will be granted.

Your Honor, item seven and eight relate MR. HAYES: to the retention and severance plan that the debtors are seeking approval for. Those items, or at least the retention and severance plan itself, remains subject to an unresolved objection, so we would propose, Your Honor, to move that to the back of the docket.

> That's fine. THE COURT:

6

7

8

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HAYES: Your Honor, the next item that we wanted 2 to take up was item number nine, which we are pleased to report we've been able to resolve the objection to that. That was 4 filed by the unions. This is our motion relating to the sale 5 of the hotel to Marriott and all the relief that we're seeking today is only the approval of the bidding procedures and the approval of certain bidding protections.

Your Honor, this is the first step in what we hope will lead to a robust auction on June 12th and a sale hearing in conjunction with a confirmation hearing on June 17, before Your Honor.

As the Court was informed at the last hearing, there was an extensive marketing effort for the debtors' assets, prepetition, led by Goldman Sachs. The culmination of that effort was the negotiation and execution, prepetition, of an asset purchase agreement with the Marriott. The terms of that transaction are set forth in the motion, were the subject of some discussion at the last hearing.

In connection with that, Your Honor, the bidding procedures are what we would deem to be fairly typical of sales that this Court has approved in recent cases, Your Honor. propose that June 8 be the deadline for overbids. We propose an auction on June 12 if overbids are received and we have reserved June 17 for the sale hearing.

The objections that have been raised to the motion

1 are essentially twofold. The first one, Your Honor, is that 2 the sale motion refers to the sale order, which is not before the Court today, containing a provision that waives the ten day 4 stay of its effectiveness. We've had discussions with union counsel before hearing and we've agreed that we will argue that issue before Your Honor in June, when that order is actually before the Court and that we need not take up the Court's time with that issue today.

5

7

8

9

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other issue that the union raised in connection with the bidding procedures relates to attendance at the auction. The objection that the union filed asked the Court to  $12 \parallel$  require that that auction be a public auction.

For a variety of reasons, Your Honor, the debtors believe that's not appropriate in this case and it would be atypical for other auctions that have had procedures that this Court has approved. The debtors have well in excess of a thousand employees, well in excess of a thousand creditors. It's our desire to have the auction be in a conference room rather than a gymnasium, and not be in a public setting.

Your Honor, we have signed with a number of interested parties confidentiality agreements. confidentiality agreements, in many instances go both ways in that they agree to keep confidential the debtors' information that they learn through diligence and we agree to keep confidential the fact that they're expressing interest in our

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

assets, at least until we are required to share their name with the Court.

Your Honor, we think that having a public auction, 4 with the participation of employees, vendors, the media, would chill bidding. Many of those interested parties, we believe, would not participate in the auction, that would not result in the maximization of value. So, we oppose any effort to have the auction be a public auction.

Having said that, Your Honor, we and Marriott, and CSX, are not opposed to the unions attending the auction. case, contrary to some of the assertions in the pleadings, has never been about secrecy, has never been about trying to push through a process without union participation.

As the Court will recall from the first hearing, this transaction as currently structured, does not close unless and until there are new collective bargaining agreements entered into by the debtors and the unions which are acceptable to Marriott or whoever is the ultimate purchaser after an auction.

Your Honor, the DIP loan that the Court has approved, has a deadline of June 10, by which the debtors must have entered into those new collective bargaining agreements. my belief, Your Honor, that if we do not have those new collective bargaining agreements by June 10 there will, in all likelihood, not be an auction because the debtor will be unable to continue operations without the ability to borrow under its

1 DIP loan.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

So, we had discussions, Your Honor, with the union counsel and we think we've reached the following agreement and I think -- I invite union counsel to correct the record if this is not accurate.

But, we would be agreeable, Your Honor, to two representatives of the unions attending the auction with counsel. It's the understanding of the debtors that they would be essentially silent observers, not active participants in the auction. We don't want an environment at the auction to chill bidding in any respect, but we welcome their attendance at the auction and I believe that that can be reflected in a revised bidding procedures order, Your Honor, and I think that would resolve the only outstanding objection to that motion.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

MR. GUERRIERI: Your Honor, the only thing I would add to that is I think --

THE COURT: Sir, if you'd come to the podium, please, 19 and identify yourself for the record.

MR. GUERRIERI: Your Honor, my name is Joseph Guerrieri. I am counsel to the nine unions which we will call the Greenbrier labor council and counsel's representations are correct. I just wanted to add, he characterized our role as that of silent observers, but we would expect to have access to information so that we would understand the proceedings, and

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that is the only thing I wanted to add to what I believe is our stipulation.

THE COURT: Well, would you be willing to enter into the confidentiality agreements that other parties would be required to?

MR. GUERRIERI: Of course. Of course, we would.

THE COURT: All right, very good.

MR. GUERRIERI: And we've done that in the past.

THE COURT: All right, very good, thank you.

MR. HAYES: Your Honor, we can work with union counsel on language for the order and on appropriate language, we might prefer a protective order to a private confidentiality agreement, but we'll work with them to arrange facilitating their attendance at the auction.

THE COURT: Just as long as it's on the same terms and conditions as other parties would be required to do.

MR. HAYES: Yes, sir. Your Honor, with resolving that objection, what we'd like to do next is make a proffer of the testimony of Mr. Michael McGovern, the debtors' CFO, in support of the bidding procedures and the bidder protections.

> THE COURT: Is Mr. McGovern in the courtroom?

MR. HAYES: Yes, sir. Mr. McGovern is seated next to me and is available for cross examination.

Mr. McGovern would testify that he is a graduate of 25∥MIT in 1989 with a degree in mechanical engineering. He has a

1 masters in transportation and logistics from MIT, received in 2 1991. He has been a full time employee of CSX, or its subsidiaries, since 1991. He formally became the Chief 4 Financial Officer of the Greenbrier in January of this year. From December 2006 through March of 2007, he served as the interim CFO at the Greenbrier.

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

Mr. McGovern would testify that he was involved in the prepetition marketing and sale process, that he was involved in the effort to negotiate an asset purchase agreement and related documents with Marriott, that he reviewed drafts of those documents.

He would testify that the bid procedures order, which is before the Court is a requirement, both of the Marriott asset purchase agreement, that that order be entered and, Your Honor, it is also a requirement under the debtor-in-possession loan, which the Court approved, that that bidding procedures order be approved in a form acceptable to the DIP lender and to Marriott, no later than April 13, otherwise we would be in default under our DIP loan.

Your Honor, Mr. McGovern would testify that he believes the bid procedures are designed to maximize the sale value of the assets, that there is great benefit to the estate from having a stalking horse and that is why the debtor worked very hard to obtain a stalking horse. The participation of a stalking horse sets the floor for other bidders to bid against.

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. McGovern would testify that it's his belief that 2 Marriott would not serve as stalking horse without the bid protections that are contained in the proposed bidding procedures. Those bid protections include a \$2 million breakup fee and an expense reimbursement capped at \$600,000.

Mr. McGovern would testify that those amounts were the subject of negotiation and are reasonable in amount and that the bidder protections benefit the debtor and benefit the sale process and are a necessary part of the procedures.

Your Honor, that would conclude the proffer from Mr. 11 McGovern in support of the bid procedures.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Does any party wish to cross examine Mr. McGovern in connection with the proffered testimony?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: All right. The proffered testimony of Mr. McGovern will be received.

MR. HAYES: Your Honor, now I'd just like to run through briefly some changes in the bid procedures order from the version that was submitted originally with the sale motion, and this redline was also filed with the Court yesterday. have an extra copy if the Court needs a copy.

THE COURT: If you have an extra copy of that, the Court would like that. Thank you.

MR. HAYES: Your Honor, similar to the DIP loan

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 order, this order now deletes references to a Creditors' 2 Committee. And, this order, of course, will be further revised to address the compromise put on the record today with the union.

Your Honor, the other material changes that I'd like to highlight, paragraph 15, we've expanded the publications in which we will publish the sale notice, to include both Charleston, West Virginia Daily newspapers.

Your Honor, in paragraph 17, we have moved up by five days the deadline by which parties in interest must file objections to the sale. Your Honor we thought that making those objections due June 5 still gave the parties in interest ample time to object to the sale motion, but, perhaps more importantly, Your Honor, or at least as importantly, would give the debtors additional time before the sale hearing to work to resolve any objections and that change is reflected in paragraph 17 of the redline bidding procedures order.

Your Honor, in the bidding procedures --

THE COURT: Let me understand the sale, the auction is conducted on June 12 and so, this objection to the approval of the sale is going to have to -- objections have to be before the auction?

It will be, Your Honor, but we have an MR. HAYES: obligation under the order to file a notice with the Court promptly after conclusion of the auction, to indicate who the

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 winner of the auction is. And the sale hearing would be on 2 June 17. To the extent parties have new objections, or need to supplement a sale objection as a result of the identification  $4 \parallel$  of a new winner of the auction or a new purchaser, we would anticipate that if those objections relate to the identity of the new purchaser, that they could be filed after that date.

THE COURT: What if somebody has an objection to the -- some irregularity regarding procedures of the auction itself, they'd be able to object to that?

MR. HAYES: We would hope that won't happen but, yes, sir, that objection could be --

THE COURT: I would hope it wouldn't happen either but we've seen that happen in some circumstances.

MR. HAYES: That objection would necessarily be filed after the auction.

THE COURT: Okay. So, what is a party objecting to as of June 5?

MR. HAYES: Well, this would be an objection to the sale of assets, free and clear of liens, if there's a lien holder that thinks that his collateral cannot be sold free and clear of his liens, he would file those objections, those type of objections.

> THE COURT: Okay. Very good.

MR. HAYES: Your Honor, the next change that I would deem material is on Page 2 of Exhibit 1 to this order, which is

the bidding procedures. And, we just changed the notice party
to be me, if parties have diligence related requests of the
debtors and that's just because on our team that's how that
role has evolved. It's not necessarily a major change.

And then, Your Honor, the third to last page of the documents you have, paragraph five in the sale notice, contains the June 5 sale objection date that we referred to earlier.

Your Honor, we'll be submitting a revised bidding procedures order to address the union issue we discussed this morning, but that's all of our presentation, Your Honor, in support of the bidding procedures order.

THE COURT: All right, thank you, Mr. Hayes. Doe any party wish to be heard in connection with the debtors' motion to approve the bid procedures relating to the sale of its assets?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: All right. Then subject to the agreement that you've reached with the unions, the Court will approve the bidding procedures.

MR. HAYES: Thank you, Your Honor. The next item on the agenda that my colleague Mr. McCollough will address is item number ten, which is a motion for relief from automatic stay.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

MR. McCOLLOUGH: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Aaron

1 McCollough of McGuireWoods for the debtors. 2 Your Honor, the next item on the agenda is a 3 preliminary hearing on a motion filed by Ms. Mazie Green, pro 4 se, for relief from the automatic stay. 5 THE COURT: Is Ms. Green in the courtroom? 6 MS. GREEN: Yes, Your Honor, I am. 7 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. All right, you may 8 proceed. 9 MR. McCOLLOUGH: And, I presume you would ask Ms. 10 Green to present her motion? 11 THE COURT: Ms. Green, you wish to present your 12 motion? 13 MS. GREEN: I'll try. THE COURT: Would you please identify yourself for 14 15 the record. MS. GREEN: Yes, I'm Mazie C. Green and I'm 16 17 representing myself, pro se. THE COURT: All right. And, you know you're entitled 18 19 to have counsel represent you if you want? 20 MS. GREEN: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Are you represented by counsel in the underlying litigation? 22 23 MS. GREEN: No, sir, I'm not.

## J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

Okay. And, you wish to proceed pro se on

24

THE COURT:

25 this motion today?

MS. GREEN: Yes, sir, I do.

1

2

3

7

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. You may proceed.

Okay. On June 7th, 2007, I filed a MS. GREEN: discrimination complaint with the United States District Court 5 for the Southern District of West Virginia at Beckley, after 6 being issued a right to sue order by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

This complaint alleged violations of federal law, the Americans With Disability Act and Title 7 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, with the court having jurisdiction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1981.

A pretrial meeting was scheduled for March 23rd, 2009 and the trial was scheduled for April the 14th, 2009, but it was canceled due to the automatic stay. I believe good cause exists to modify the stay.

Public policy. Employees may not be retaliated against or terminated for filing a charge of discrimination with the government agency. I had filed a charge with the West Virginia Human Rights Commission in 2003. And I had also filed charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, as protective activity. I had also filed complaints with the union, Union Local 863.

It is unlawful for an employer to coerce, intimidate, threaten and interfere with any individual, in the exercise or enjoyment of or on account of his or her having exercised or

enjoyed, or having aided or abetted, which I didn't do, any 2 right granted by this act.

The delay imposed by the automatic stay will not be The case was ready for trial. There were motions 4∥ minimal. that the judge needed to decide that -- well, we were hoping to decide in the pretrial meeting.

As I said, I represented myself, pro se. lot of work on my behalf, to file the complaint with the federal court. It took a lot of work on my behalf to try and obtain witnesses. If the Greenbrier is allowed to sell the hotel, I'll lose all my witnesses.

> THE COURT: Why is that?

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. GREEN: Because I have no guarantee that the management -- a lot of my witnesses are management. I have no guarantee that those managers are going to still be there. Ι have -- I don't know the managers address. The subpoenas that were supposed to be issued were to be issued to the employer's I had requested earlier, during discovery, for the address. employer to give the home addresses and they wouldn't.

I had worked for the Greenbrier for 25 years, I had

THE COURT: Have you conducted depositions of these individuals?

> MS. GREEN: No, no.

THE COURT: Okay.

I didn't have money, I'll be honest. MS. GREEN: Ι  $2 \parallel$  did not have money to do that. I had worked for the Greenbrier for 25 years, I was injured at work. I had life insurance,  $4 \parallel 401k$ , vacation, weekends off, bonuses, dental insurance. I had excellent credit.

It's taken an extreme amount of time in order for me to fight for my federally protected rights and I do believe that these are my federally protected rights.

And, I would like for the Court to allow me to continue with this lawsuit.

THE COURT: Tell me why you can't continue with that lawsuit in this court?

MS. GREEN: In this court?

THE COURT: Yes.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. GREEN: Because there's so many that my --

I mean the way that bankruptcy works THE COURT: generally, is that all of the assets come into this court, and they're liquidated and then there will be funds to distribute to the creditors of the estate. If you are a creditor of the estate, there's a procedure, then for all creditors, not just you, but every other creditor, to come in a file a claim in this court. If your claim is disputed by the debtor, then the Court resolves the claim and then you would receive your pro rata share of the distribution from the estate as well as everybody else. It's a collective process to resolve all

1 claims. Why would we go outside of that procedure in this 2 case, for your claim?

3

5 II

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. GREEN: Because my case involves a mixture of 4 things that the District Court in Beckley is aware of. I filed a lot of motions, the Greenbrier has filed a lot of motions, 6 that still need to be decided.

And, it's just like I say, it's against public policy to retaliate against an employee. I had filed -- I had complained about race discrimination, I had been injured on my job, I asked to be accommodated, they refused to even talk to me about accommodation.

I filed a complaint. I filed a complaint with the Human Rights Commission, I filed a complaint with the EEOC, after I was terminated. I had filed a complaint -- they had made me take functional capacity evaluations. They made me take three functional capacity evaluations.

But they had accommodated another white waitress and she didn't have to take functional -- but they refused to accommodate me and they refused to even talk with me after I, you know, I had -- and they were aware of these complaints.

The labor relations manager at the Greenbrier, he was aware, they denied that they were aware of them, but they were aware of them.

> THE COURT: All right, very good. Anything further? MS. GREEN: I don't think so, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Green, thank you very much. Let me hear from counsel for the debtor.

MS. GREEN: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. McCollough.

MR. McCOLLOUGH: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, turning from the merits of the litigation to the motion for relief from stay, I think what we've heard is that the principle allegation of cause that would support relief is delay and delay is one consequence of a Chapter 11 filing that not only affects Ms. Green, but affects every other creditor of the estate, and that's for a good reason, that the debtors are entitled to their breathing space from the assertions of claims by creditors, including litigation claimants. Ms. Green is not the only party that has asserted litigation against the debtors and the other litigations are also stayed.

Your Honor, we heard Ms. Green state that a number of her witnesses will be management of the debtors. A lot of that management that would have to be involved in trial preparation here are also directly responsible for many of the key issues in this bankruptcy case, including labor negotiations and employee relations and for those management to be distracted through trial preparation on liquidation of a prepetition claim, we just don't feel that that would be constructive and would not constitute cause for relief from the automatic stay.

THE COURT: Well, Ms. Green made the point that the

1 trial was scheduled, or is scheduled, rather, for April 14. 2 Hasn't all the trial preparation already been concluded and such and would we just -- would it make more sense to not lose 4 the benefit of all the preparation that's already gone on in 5 this case, so that we can get this claim liquidated at least, 6 you know, going forward?

MR. McCOLLOUGH: Well, Your Honor, the trial date certainly is scheduled, was scheduled for that date, before the district court judge stayed the action until, according to the judge's order, until the conclusion of this bankruptcy proceeding.

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor, the motion for relief from stay was filed two days after the Chapter 11 petition was filed and given the circumstances of this case, whereas, you know, Your Honor, we're on a very tight time line. The debtors' employees, as 16 you may hear a little later, also are stretched very thin already and these additional distractions for the liquidation of a claim, it's the debtors' position that the judicial economy that may result from that would not overcome the burden that the debtors would face by having to deal with this distraction. And while there have been pretrial motions that have been filed, there still remains a great deal of trial preparation to go, in terms of dealing with potential witnesses and the management that would necessarily be witnesses in these proceedings.

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. The other point that Ms. 2 Green raised, was the fact that, perhaps, some of her witnesses wouldn't be available in the future if there was delay. Can 4 you address that issue? MR. McCOLLOUGH: Your Honor, we anticipate, as the Court well knows, moving quickly to confirmation of a plan and we would anticipate dealing with liquidation and any disputes with regard to prepetition claims soon thereafter. And, so, we anticipate moving very quickly, and while 10∥ there is some delay that inevitably would result, we would move the process along and we feel that that short delay would not 12 necessarily result in a loss of availability of witnesses. THE COURT: With the anticipated sale in June, you'd be able to get to the claims resolution process and start dealing with that, perhaps, by the end of the summer? MR. McCOLLOUGH: That would be the debtors' hope, 17 Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Anything further? MR. McCOLLOUGH: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Green, do you have anything further? No, sir. No, Your Honor. MS. GREEN:

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Green, the Court is going to deny your motion for relief from the automatic stay. Bankruptcy Code 362(d) provides that the court can grant relief

1 for cause but I don't think that we have cause that has been  $2 \parallel$  established in this case by the mere delay of the trial date, especially when we have an established procedure in this court 4 to liquidate your claim and resolve that as part of the bankruptcy process in the ordinary course. I don't think there will be undue delay, given how fast this case is going to be going and that your claim will be able to be addressed fairly shortly in this court.

5

7

8

9

11

12

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That ruling is without prejudice to you, to renew 10∥ your motion in the future if you think that there has been delay, or unnecessary delay or if other cause that you want to present to the Court comes forward, you may renew your motion for relief from stay in the future. But at this point, I'm not going to grant the relief. You are certainly free to file a proof of claim in this court for the amount of damage you think you have incurred and pursue the claim in this court.

Any questions on the Court's ruling, Ms. Green? MS. GREEN: Like I said, I just thought it's against public policy, Your Honor. I thought that discrimination is something that's still relevant in this society.

THE COURT: And the claim will certainly be addressed. I'm not saying that you do not have a claim, or your claim is without merit. That's certainly not what this Court is saying at all and I'm not saying that the kinds of activities that you're complaining about are not against public 1 policy, they certainly are, if you can prove them. 2 saying that we have a procedure to go forward in this court to resolve those kinds of claims as well as every other kind of claim in this case and it will be properly addressed in this court. All right, thank you.

MR. McCOLLOUGH: Thank you, Your Honor. Mr. Hayes will present the final matters on the agenda.

> THE COURT: All right.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 **|** 

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

MR. HAYES: Your Honor, the last item on the agenda that remains contested is the debtors' motion for approval of certain severance and retention plans for certain non-insider employees. The one objection was filed by the unions.

Your Honor, by this motion, the debtors are seeking authority to pay a fairly limited sum, to a limited group of non-insider, non-union salaried employees.

Your Honor, on the retention side, there are three eligible employees, the aggregate retention payments approximate \$97,000. These are prepetition agreements that were entered into with the individuals involved to try to keep them with the company, through the closing of a transaction and we are seeking authority to honor the post petition amounts that come due under those agreements, without assuming the agreements themselves.

We think, Your Honor, that this is within the 25 boundaries of other retention programs that the Court has

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 **|** 

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

approved. We're not subject to the restrictions in 503 that  $2 \parallel \text{relate}$  to the participation of insiders. We are subject to 363's requirement that the retention plan be within the 4 debtors' business judgment and we believe that these payments are.

Your Honor, the second part of this motion relates to nine individuals, who have prepetition severance agreements. Again, they're all non-insiders, they're salaried non-union employees. The aggregate amount of the severance that we're seeking authority to pay is about \$1.1 million. Each of these individuals, Your Honor, performs a very important function at the hotel. Each of them is dealing with a number of additional job requirements in light of the diligence activity that's going on with interested parties, the compliance with the additional reporting obligations of the bankruptcy process, and working to maintain the business to a closing of the sale transaction.

The severance that they're entitled to is one year's 19∥ worth of pay and they are entitled to it in the event that they are terminated without cause, their job responsibilities are materially reduced, the debtors experience a change of control or sell their assets and the eligible employee is not offered a position with similar authority with the new owners or the eligible employee is offered a position with the new owner at a reduced salary.

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Here, it's important to note, Your Honor, Section 5.05 of the asset purchase agreement requires the Marriott to propose employment to any employees governed by the collective 4 bargaining agreements that are employed at the time of closing. How long they retain them is up to Marriott but there is no similar requirement for non-union employees in the asset purchase agreements. So there are a number of non-union employees that are not going to have the same level of assurance at the time of closing, as union employees.

One of the criticisms that was made by the unions in their objection is that there is no mitigation articulated in the motion and that's an oversight on our part, Your Honor. It is longstanding practice of CSX and its subsidiaries, that in the event an employee is severed in connection with a sale of a division or a business and that employee receives severance, at the time of receipt of severance, which is payable in lump sum, the employee is required to sign an agreement that says if they take a job with the acquirer at that location within the 12 months after severance, they have to give back the severance received, and that is how this program will work, Your Honor.

MR. HAYES: Have to give it back in full, that's So, there is mitigation here, that is company practice and we should have indicated that in the motion but that's how this program will work, Your Honor.

Have to give it back in full?

THE COURT:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Now, you say it's company practice. 2 that in the severance agreements that these employees have already signed, the prepetition severance agreements?

MR. HAYES: It's not in the agreements they've signed, but it's in the -- actually, I'm not positive about that, but it will be in the agreement that they sign before they can receive the severance.

> THE COURT: All right, very good.

MR. HAYES: Your Honor, the other criticism that was lobbied by the unions, I think, relates to the fact that the exhibit to the motion was filed under seal. The copy that was submitted to the Court under seal had the individual employee names, had their base salary and had their retention and severance amounts.

Your Honor, we have prepared an exhibit that deletes the names but indicates their title, and we would be prepared to share that with the union if they would agree on the record to keep it confidential, not share it with any other party, any of their union members, just with union counsel and their primary contact at the union and we can talk specifically about each of the job titles and why they're very critical to the process that the company is ongoing at the moment.

So, I would yield the podium, Your Honor, to see if that mechanism would be acceptable to the union. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

19 I

MR. GUERRIERI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll endeavor to be brief.

THE COURT: Once again, if you'd just mention your -- identify yourself for the record.

MR. GUERRIERI: I sure will, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So that we have it on the transcript if we ever need that.

MR. GUERRIERI: Of course. Joseph Guerrieri, representing the Greenbrier Council of Labor Unions, nine labor unions in all.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. GUERRIERI: Thank you, Your Honor. The reason this objection was filed was that upon reviewing the motion, it became clear to us and to our clients, that very little information was provided as to who these individuals are, why their maintenance was vital to the ongoing debtors' enterprise and why substantial adverse consequences would result if these individuals did not receive these large payoffs.

We are particularly concerned because as Mr. Hayes has pointed out, we are currently engaged in some very painful collective bargaining. We recognize and I have made it clear and, frankly, the various unions involved and their members, I think fully understand what the possible consequences can be of a Chapter 11 proceeding, particularly with an 1113 proceeding

1 staring us in the face.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

But whatever agreement we reach and I am hopeful and optimistic that one will be reached, whatever agreement we 4 reach, must be ratified by the 900 or so employees who are affected by the collective bargaining agreement.

When the average individual sees that what is being proffered to the Court is a key employee plan of approximately \$1.2 million, where nine individuals will receive a full year's salary, even if they are terminated, if their work duties are reduced, so the less they do, the more they will be paid, theoretically, and if they are not offered a position at the same salary that is satisfactory to them, they can leave and 13 take a full year's salary.

And the fourth point is, if they're offered a job they don't just accept, they will get 100 percent of their salary. This seems to us not to be consistent with a sound business judgment and the reasonableness threshold determination that must be made in a case of this type.

I was pleased to hear Mr. Hayes say that it was an oversight that mitigation was not formally addressed with the Court. That was one of our larger objections, if you will, Your Honor, and that is helpful to us and is helpful in explaining what is going on in these proceedings, to the membership. And I assure you we want to cooperate fully with this proceeding because we want to see the Greenbrier

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19 II

20

21

22

23

24

25

resurrected with as many employees as possible in place. is our goal here, it's not to be obstructionists.

But when you see a motion like the, that has so 4 little information provided, and at the time, of course, we again didn't know about the mitigation aspect of it, but so little information provided, one is left to wonder, who are these people and why are they more critical to the operation than the employees who, as the Court I'm sure is aware, are being asked --

THE COURT: Well, they're all employees, right? MR. GUERRIERI: Yes, Your Honor. I'm talking about the rank and file. I assume these are executive position employees, or management employees that are not covered by a collective bargaining agreement, yes, but they all are employees, there's no question about it and they're all -- they all will suffer if this enterprise ceases operation.

> THE COURT: Exactly.

MR. GUERRIERI: Yet, it strikes us that with so little information available to us, and to the Court, it is very difficult to make a judgment about whether these people are, in fact, vital to this operation, so vital, in fact, that nine have to be guaranteed 100 percent of their salary, and another three will be dividing something like \$90,000 over three months.

But, again, Your Honor, our point is that this

1 certainly does not appear reasonable, the information that has 2 been provided does not seem adequate upon which this Court can make a judgment that this has been done in the best interest of the debtor, and as a result of careful consideration and with sound business judgment. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this question, though, before you leave.

> MR. GUERRIERI: Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Hayes had suggested offering to you, on a confidential basis, a copy of the Exhibit B that he has prepared but just indicating the position of each of these 12∥ people and the amount of the proposed severance that they would receive. Would that address your question or your concerns that you raised in your objection about the lack of information about, you know, who these people are, or are you saying that you actually need to know the names of these people?

MR. GUERRIERI: I don't think I need to know the 18 names, Your Honor.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GUERRIERI: I don't think that's -- I don't think that was the thrust of our argument. I think it was to try to identify what are the functions of these individuals and why are they so critical to this operation, that these people should receive such favorable treatment when the represented employees are facing severe reductions, including for many,

 $1 \parallel \text{maybe}$  up to 40 percent, the loss of all healthcare. And we 2∥ just think these are very serious consequences and it seems 3 most inappropriate to be treating one group differently, so 4 differently than another.

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

14

15

16

17 l

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Then, I'm going to require that Mr. Hayes, in accordance with his offer, provide you on that confidential basis, a copy of the Exhibit B with the job titles and the amounts.

MR. GUERRIERI: And I think I heard Mr. Hayes say, I  $10 \parallel$  can share that with the principals, who are involved in the Greenbrier negotiations.

THE COURT: Are there -- tell me who that -- those 13 people are. How large a group is that and how does that work?

MR. GUERRIERI: Well, Your Honor, actually, there are nine unions involved, but there's a chief negotiator and he has, basically, has an assistant, I think there'd be two and we'd agreed previously that two union leaders would be involved or participate, if you will, by observing the auction process. I think it would be fair to keep the same restriction in place.

THE COURT: That seems reasonable to me, but let me hear if Mr. Hayes has any objection to that.

MR. HAYES: Your Honor, if I understand what you just said, counsel for the union would receive this chart and would keep it confidential and then two representatives of the nine unions in the aggregate, so two individuals total, could

receive them and would also be required to keep them confidential.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

We have it here, Your Honor, we were prepared to 4 share it with union counsel today, share it with the Court, and request that the Court remove from the courtroom those that either did not object to the motion or are not CSX or debtor representatives because we very much do not want this information to be in the public domain. The Court has sealed similar information in other cases, and the risk is that the individual at the next desk is not getting the same treatment, is upset about that, and that is damaging to morale as a whole. So, that was our proposal, we think that deals with the secrecy allegation that the union counsel has made and if the proposal is counsel only and two representatives of the nine unions, each subject to a confidentiality obligation that we can put in a protective order, Your Honor, and submit to the Court after the hearing, that would be acceptable to us.

THE COURT: Okay, very good. Mr. Van Arsdale, do you 19 wish to be heard on this procedure or what we're about to undertake?

MR. VAN ARSDALE: Robert Van Arsdale for the U.S. Trustee. Your Honor, I only have one point about the motion for the retention and severance programs and it is said throughout the motion, that this applies only to non-insiders and I'm not saying that I doubt that that's true, but --

THE COURT: I assume we're going to get some 2 testimony along those lines.

1

3

5

7

9

10

11

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VAN ARSDALE: In paragraph -- okay. But in 4 paragraph 35 they talk about a couple of the things that makes somebody an insider. But there's also a provision in 10131 which talks about, you can also be, in terms of a corporation, you can also be an insider if you are relative of a director, officer or person in control of the debtor. And I don't see that covered anywhere in the papers.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm going to reserve your objection. As I understand what Mr. Hayes wants to do at this point, is to provide a copy of the exhibit to counsel for the labor unions. I'm going to also require -- I think you already have Exhibit B that was filed under seal, but if you don't, you get a copy of this, too, and then we'll clear the courtroom of anybody that has not filed an objection to this motion, or anybody that's not affiliated with the debtor and then proceed with the motion, where the debtor can put on its evidence and that sort of thing, to go forward. Do you have any objection to that procedure?

MR. VAN ARSDALE: No, Your Honor. That's -- I think that's an excellent idea.

THE COURT: Okay, very good. Mr. Hayes, do I understand what you've proposed as far as how you wish to proceed at this point?

MR. HAYES: Yes, sir, that's correct. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. Now, the question about your DIP financer, are they allowed to remain for this or are they 4 parties that since they didn't file an objection, need to be 5 excluded? 6 MR. HAYES: No, Your Honor, they are permitted to 7 stay. 8 THE COURT: Okay. MR. HAYES: Our DIP lender. 9 10 THE COURT: Anybody else permitted to stay that 11 wasn't on the original list of who had to be excluded? 12 MR. HAYES: No, sir, just CSX, the objector, the U.S. 13 Trustee and the debtors. THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, what we'll do at 14 this point, we'll take a five minute recess, I'll ask the Court security officer to clear the courtroom of anybody other than those and to seal the courtroom so that we can conduct the 17 l 18 hearing, under seal. 19 COURT CLERK: All rise. Court is now in recess. 20 (Short recess in proceedings) 21 [Portion of transcript redacted] 22 THE COURT: All right. All right. Let the record reflect that the doors to the courtroom have been unlocked and 23

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

MR. HAYES: Your Honor, we just want to reiterate the

24 the courtroom has now been reopened.

25

applicable legal standard is whether the proposed retention and 1  $2 \parallel$  severance is within the debtors' business judgment. We believe through the testimony of Mr. McGovern we have amply 4 demonstrated that to be the case. The company is at a very 5 sensitive moment in terms of trying to juggle a number of balls in the air. These individuals are critical to that effort. 6 The loss of any one of them would be devastating to our efforts 7 8 to get the company to a sale closing. And, Your Honor, we really have no other presentation on this motion, but we 10  $\parallel$  believe we well exceed the requirements of the bankruptcy code. We have sufficient borrowing availability under our DIP loan to 11 12 permit this. This is an authorized expense under our DIP loan. Our DIP lender would not authorize this expense if the DIP lender did not share the debtors' view that these payments are really critical to be able to get the company to a sale closing 15 and we would ask the Court to favorably consider the motion. 16 THE COURT: All right, thank you. Do you wish to be 18 heard on the motion? MR. GUERRIERI: The Court has been generous in its time and I've argued fully. We would simply rely on our brief, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right, thank you, sir. Any other party wish to be heard in connection with the debtors' motion? 23 (No audible response)

17

19

21

22

24

25

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hayes, I understand that

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the relief that you are asking for is that you be authorized, 2 but not directed, to make these severance and retention payments. In other words, you're not assuming these prepetition agreements, you just want authority to make the payments under Section 503, is that correct?

> MR. HAYES: Yes, sir, that's correct.

THE COURT: All right. The Court has reviewed the motion and has reviewed the response filed by the unions and based on the arguments that the Court has heard today, and the testimony of Mr. McGovern, the Court finds that it is within the sound exercise of the debtors' business judgment, to be authorized to make these severance and retention payments.

The Court finds that these individuals are not insiders of the debtor and so, therefore, are not subject to Section 503(c) of the bankruptcy code.

The Court also finds that their continued employment with the debtor is critical as they are the core leadership of the debtor and both from a financial management and from being able to operate and maintain the Greenbrier facility through this difficult time, are essential to be retained and I'm satisfied that the debtor, with the participation of Protiviti, has been able to determine that the one year of severance is sufficient to incentivize these individuals to remain with the debtor. I certainly hope that's the case. And so for all of those reasons, the Court will grant the debtors' motion.

2

6

7

11

12

13

17

18

19 II

20

21

22

23

24

25

Any questions regard to the Court's ruling?

MR. GUERRIERI: Only to note, Your Honor, that Mr. Hayes represented that mitigation was an -- omitting mitigation  $4\parallel$  was an oversight and that mitigation would, indeed, be part of 5 these agreements.

THE COURT: Thank you very much for that clarification. And that is exactly correct. I'd assumed that without saying it, since we had agreed to that at the beginning, but that certainly is the Court's understanding and would expect to see the order that's tendered reflect that as well.

MR. HAYES: That's correct, Your Honor. housekeeping matters relating to this. Your Honor, we have 14 motion to seal the version of the exhibit that had individual 15 names that was submitted to the Court. There was no opposition 16 filed to that motion to seal and we would ask the Court to grant that motion to seal that exhibit.

That motion will be granted. And as I THE COURT: indicated earlier, the exhibit that you have tendered in connection with the testimony of Mr. McGovern today, will also be placed under sealed.

MR. HAYES: And, Your Honor, can we make similar arrangements for the potion of the transcript relating to Mr. McGovern's testimony?

THE COURT: Yes, you may. So that that portion of

1 the transcript can be placed under seal. There are procedures 2 in place to be able to do that, so please follow through with that.

MR. HAYES: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, anything else that we need to take

6 up today?

MR. HAYES: No, sir.

THE COURT: Does any other party have any business

that we need to take up today?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: All right. Thank you all.

COURT CLERK: All rise. Court is now adjourned.

13

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

# \* \* \* \* \*

<u>CERTIFICATION</u>

I, ELAINE HOWELL, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter and to the best of my ability.

/s/ Elaine Howell Date: April 29, 2009

ELAINE HOWELL

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.